

Oct 22, 1991

Hionia

[Bateson to me:]

Tokyo

"you stress continuity, in use of Barb;
Other stress radical, injure discontinuity;

Bath stones are true.

(Though few of latter know the former
point of view, on the facts underlying it.)

KB: I've come to doubt the usefulness of guilt.

(I don't know, for individual; but I agree, as an approach to social change — I distrust the social deprecations — on all sides — evoked by an effort to arouse guilt. (Shame?)
(blame? Can't avoid this) responsibility

Kang Triakha

in 21-year-old journal

EE: History is to facilitate action, to instigate for change.

Resolution Leader

(Latin: Gandhi, Luther, Jesus)

(Klein? Hitler?) Marx?

LQ

Nielsen

22 Oct 94

Kary Friedman is (leaving early to) get to
Exec Committee of Org of American Historians - He insisted
that Nielsen/Luthersson be on the agenda.

Freud & Hermann:

People with Trauma feel: "Did I imagine that?" Can it have happened? Many don't have round types of

America and ~~was~~ hyper-america - clearer than round, ~~was~~ more vivid, present - characteristic of trauma

5 Symposia on Trauma + Memory [where?]

If memories are so deeply engrained, how can they be also forgotten.

Freud? "Memory is an action

"Freud + Breuer knew this, too, until

Memory mediated by terror - they enter an altered state of consciousness.

Attention extremely narrow - context falls away, time slows, de-personalization: this isn't happening to me
de-realization
- "This isn't really happening."

Memories originating in this altered state are not accessible by ordinary methods of retrieval:
can't ask, "What were surroundings? Sequence? What else was happening?"

or exorcising the
Access to memories is not the problem: integrating them is. But you do have to access them.

At this stage, the perpetrator feels - they fear that access will be followed not only by catharsis but by a vengeful strike. It becomes important to avoid access:
1) to protect perpetrators' immunity; 2) to preserve social power (mother); (3) to preserve relation to perpetrator - protects him from himself, protect me from attacking him - ad to his protectors, depends on mother, siblings

When the memory ^{of abuse} begins to emerge, person faces
dispair. How can I live, in a world where basic trust
was violated, where parent-child relations were abused...

Mourning process

needs a

must suspect a leap to judgment ("charge of
false memory") to believe testimony of an alleged
perpetrator against an alleged family victim.

VN Memorial is the closest we have come to an
expression of grief about the War.

We need many more such places."

Restatocking

Mary Fairchild (?) initiated "consciousness-raising sessions":

"Speak Bitterness" sessions of the Red Army;

"Vomit bitter water."

Scinner: A place where people could speak the truth
without fear.

"Restatocking knew what they were doing was revolutionary.
Therapists often don't realize that the invitation to speak the
truth, in private — ^{SAY} TELL SECRETS, STOP LYING — is personally revolutionary."
Needs

[I gave the US public a new ^{basis for} memory: PP.]
Hush + My Kai.

RL:

"Thought-reflex: When you experience something other than you're supposed to feel or believe, you're wrong."

RL: The Trauma enters into a realm of transcendence — What talked to survivors; they seemed to bring the dead into the room.

Hypernomia

Notin: Audience: the victim, the perpetrator, the witnesses (therapist); and the judge (court, jury, public, media, Congress...)

Are there ways in which everyone can participate in the therapeutic case

"Henry Adams case" — pardon the criminal, for sake of social peace; but don't re-name the crime ("don't call it a 'political crime'") (?)

let him be a 'pardonable killer.'

Oct 23

Kiroshia Monday, Portland

most ~~blatant~~ ^{ad Amer. troops} Americans believed, on August 5, that the Japanese would, ^{before surrendering} resist occupation and American military govt to the death, and that the only way to achieve their necessary goals was by a bloody invasion against suicidal resistance on the model of Okinawa, greatly magnified.

If we were mistaken. What hst and all of his top advisers knew, secretly, in July or earlier, was that the Japanese were ~~ready to accept~~ ^{probably or} on the verge of surrender, and that they would almost ~~surely~~ ^{probably} surrender by mid-August - without the Bomb - after an SU entry and after the US had indicated, ^{- as they were more willing to do, and did do -} that they would accept the maintenance of the Emperor as a figurehead.

[Why, then, Bomb? Why not? Why Aug 14-15 1000-plane raid?

^{There never had been any substantial opposition to dropping}
[Possible obstacle: a successful Aug ^{Japanese inv. - except timing} coup, and demand KYOTO for somewhat broader concessions

(grantable?) - still accepting defeat and occupation.

[Did the most ambitious Aug demands include:

no occupation?

no mil. gov?

ending of Jap. govt?] not by Aug 9

not, for Jap. by July 11 (cover to date)

On Aug. 6, they were led to hope, by hst's announcement of the Bomb and warning to the Japanese, that there might be an alternative - the Bomb - to an invasion. ^{THE TWO BOMBS TOTALLY}

^{OBSCURED, IN AMERICAN CONSCIOUSNESS, TWO ALMOST-SIMULTANEOUS EVENTS - SU ENTRY AND US SIGNAL ON EMPEROR -}

On Aug 10/15, they were ended, without invasion -

apparently as a result of the Bomb, or 2 Bombs

WHICH

This means that a particular ^{hospital} ^{or should have been} ^{was a strong} ^{indication} ^{against/discrimination} ^{to} ^{use the Bomb} ^{when it was} ^{that} ^{and} ^{necessary} - the only alternative to ~~invasion~~ ^{to avert invasion?}

3 Oct 23

Historiography:

How cover-up:

- Wartime secrecy: on machines to murder, ^{USG answers, opposition to or alterations to} SC units, Emperor
- Failure to reveal, after war ^{Bob}
- Hist movements
- Strasser article
- Strasser memoir: (+ response to)

what it still didn't reveal

(e.g. USG awareness of J. machines to murder, train, and proposals with USG)

- Military: lack of felt and for bomb.

Opposition by the [get confirmation]

- Reaction to Alperovitz, 1965 (20th anniversary)
- "Official" histories
- Media treatment at 40th anniversary (1985)

(What of 1975? check. 30th

N remembrance: IGNORED

Remember

my news of threats: 1981

USE OF BOMB SINCE NAGASAKI

Response to this — ^{Repression of} deformation — see McG B (again!)

as, on C-15: Tell McN.

1980: from threats of Center!

- Enola Gay: Vets' response to Smith.
Congress, media response

(Coming: Japanese books, retrospectives?
Ota?

Books of: Mitchell + Wright [let me see!]

Alperovitz

(Holding? McMillan?

known

opinion

RHODES (Cher with Markham, Rhodes)

NOLLOWAY ON SO

see Adall-
no review

Bernstein?

4 Oct 23

I want to abstain from issues of guilt, blame, criminality, moral judgment —

because my ~~understand~~ goal is to draw lesson from this first case for the current degrees of probif. and ~~under~~ ~~war~~ —

for ~~the~~ to understand the circumstances under which "ordering" leaders possessing nuclear weapons might decide to threaten the or launch nuclear attacks (or lose control, to others who would do these): the motives, the situation, the pressures...

[and to expand, modernize]
and the incentives to acquire the weapons, and the reluctance to ~~relinquish~~ relinquish the — or the threat of FV.
and the postwar obstacles (i.e. USG) to effective control.

Tsarna's intentions to use the Bomb as of May-July-August — and his effective considerations, motives, and advice — were radically different from what he and Strasser represented them to be, and what many everyone believes.
+ what explicit implies or says

Nearly everyone — believing the official account, which perfectly fits the facts known to them — believes that everyone shares the same view of the factual situation (unless some critics are simply ignorant of what is "generally known"; Obrianian cas. + pop. sciences, papers for US invasion, pop. press, "high" cas. estimates)

so that blame of lot or rejection of Bomb must rest on extreme, radical, alien values — pure pac, pure pac, anti-American — e.g. one that or use could never be justified, even by the officially-~~presented~~ disordered situation facing Tsarna.

I actually think:

1) Almost any President in Truman's actual situation would have done what he did; (extenuating!)

[FDR? Wallace??

Byrnes, yes? Carter? Absolutely No!

- If approval of France/Sydney report? Current report? (Walter Reuther; my Catherine Batters)
- What if the Committee with Byrnes' view?

2) Any Pres in Truman's alleged situation would have used Bomb — and public would have demanded it (as Stimson said in '46) (anyone but a "total pac")

3) ~~It~~ In the situation lost even into in April — after "reception" of fire-bombing of Tokyo — he surely did not see it as a moral issue ("no big deal," like Clegg; "not a great problem": NO ONE — EXCEPT IKE (?) ~~and~~ (LEANED, NO?)

FRANK REPORT

AND SZILARD PETITION (NOT TO HST) — EXPRESSED STRONG, OR ANY, REASON NOT TO USE BOMB AT ALL (despite we gained feeling it was not "necessary" or that alternatives ^{into} existed for earlier end)

even if we took no initiative (SU would come in, perhaps would approach us with them, by Aug 8/15; US initiative was possibly necessary for earlier end)

[ADD CONANT/OPPIE MOTIVE — RARELY MENTIONED! — TO LIST OF MOTIVES FOR USE.]

4) Nor should he; in his context, war was not a crime: except in terms that would have condemned continued fire-bombing as well

(would she have opposed this?)

What was his view on fire-bombing of Japan?

NYP: AFTER SLAUGHTER OF MIL. IN WWI, JUST-WAR RESTRAINT WAS LIKELY (SURE?) TO ERODE.

on Dresden?!

(though not explicit — US+UK: RATHER: IN FACE OF AIRPOWER CHALLENGE.

5) Was fire-bombing of Tokyo a crime? (FOR's!)

(In context of Berlin, Dresden: earlier!)

Was it justified (moral def); necessary, or reasonably thought to be so? (What did they think? Any?)

(cf. Emperor's view as of late '44: What was known of this, then? or, by March '45? How much affected by

Would warning "have had effect?"

- Wf missed defense of Okinawa?

Hyp: like planned defense against invasion: to
offset time of summer!
But, how much?

[But laid into this!]

See end of VN War: N, NVN air.

^a
Mother
Conant - Walter Reich / Bateson: Wasn't a
demonstration of Berlin's destruction needed, to
motivate int. control?

- But suppose alternative shows:

1. By Hitler
2. " " after US warning; and then, US lack
of retaliation! (Failure of (US) deterrence!
-
months -)
3. US use bomb as ~~months~~ SC entry or assault!
(no effect)
4. "Need for" 10 bombs! (Possible?)
5. As happened: but with public entry or retaliation.
6. " " WORST EFFECTS - "LEAST GOOD WAY TO
DEMONSTRATE" -

~~XXXXXXXXXXXX~~

most likely to have
effects on one Power
Architect of England.
+ France.

- Wf critical defense of Okinawa?

My: like planned defense against invasion: to
offset loss of manpower.

But, how much?

[But loyal into this!]

See end of VN War: N, NVN air.

2
Mother

Comment - Walter Reisch / Bateson: Wasn't a
demonstration of ban's distinctions needed, to
motivate int. control?

- But suppose attitudes droop

1. By Hitch

2. " " after US warnings; and then, US lack
of retal: (Failure of (US) deterrence!

3. US use ban as months SC entry or assess!
(no effect)

4. "Need for" 10 bombes: (Possible?)

5. As happened: but with public entering a situation.

6. " "

WORST EFFECTS - "LEAST GOOD WAY TO
DEMONSTRATE" -

~~XXXXXXXXXXXX~~

most likely to have
effects on Gov Power
Industrial of England.
+ France.

RL:

"Thought-reflex: When you experience something other than you're supposed to feel or believe, you're wrong."

RL: The trauma enters into a realm of transcendence — what talked to survivors, they seem to bring the lens into the room.

Hypernomia

Robin: Audience: the victim, the perpetrator, the witnesses (therapist); and the judge (court, jury, public, media, Congress...)

Are there ways in which everyone can participate in the therapeutic case

"King Adams case" — pardon the criminal, for sake of social peace; but don't re-name the crime ("don't call it a 'political crime'") (?)

let him be a "pardon killer."

(Nixon). Begin? Arafat?

Strozier: the King Adams case: "One day the man is a ^{killer} ~~assassin~~, the next he has turned to peace-making... ^{glorious}
Do we really forget that he "is" (was) a criminal, a murderer?"

TR/
well: HAK/
Begin/
Arafat (Robin)

now: Cedras?
Constant?
Saddam? (to be kept in)
Glasgow Melrose

More urgent(?) than "species identity";
[The need to find all non-violent / species- and fairly-preserving
alternatives to revenge (jealousy, envy), (e.g. for humiliation, abuse)
and counter to impulses to revenge [corollaries?], "avengence" of
(management of, control / restraint of...)]
and how to choose, deal with, the (violation of) social consensus of child + sexual abuse. [STEINER'S
NUCLEAR
Christianity, politics
Hendriks? NVR

ASK LIFTON AGAIN: What did Erikson mean? What was his relation to Hendriks?